REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued April 23, 2007, claims 3 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Day, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,763,356 (Day) in view of Kennedy et al., U.S Patent No. 6,651,217 (Kennedy). Claims 1-2 and 4-9 appear to have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 2 were objected to.

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-3 were amended in response to the objections to the claims and in order to clarify the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention. No new matter has been added.

The present invention is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the references relied upon in the Office Action, as the prior art references do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 10-15 are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy. The combination of Day and Kennedy does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining

the at least one further data entry field. The combination of Day and Kennedy only discloses displaying the same further data entry field regardless of the data value entered into a data entry field.

Day discloses that when a user (purchaser) wishes to enter a value in a field, such as model field 41, the field is highlighted and a menu of predefined entries, such as tool 40, is displayed. To "fill in" field 41, all the user needs to do is to point to one of the entries 42 through 46 in tool 40. For example, if it is assumed that a purchaser wishes to purchase the CONVERTIBLE model, then the user points to that entry. As shown in FIG. 4, the form entry system, responsive thereto (a) inserts the name CONVERTIBLE in field 41, (b) erases menu 40 from the display of panel 15, (c) highlights the next field-the Year field-and (d) brings up the corresponding tool 50 to fill in that field. Thus, each tool displayed by Day is displayed in response to the highlighting of a particular field, and is not displayed according to the value entered into the highlighted field. Indeed, the displayed tool cannot be displayed according to the value entered into the highlighted field because the tool is displayed before a value is entered into the highlighted field and the tool is used to enter a value into the highlighted field.

Thus, Day only discloses displaying the same further data entry field when a first data entry field is highlighted. Day does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according

to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, as is required by claim 3.

Even when Day is combined with Kennedy, the resulting combination still does not disclose the present invention as claimed. Kennedy discloses monitoring form fields to determine whether values have been entered into all the fields of the form or whether some fields are empty. Kennedy, at col. 6, lines 38-61, discloses that one technique for obtaining an initial set of data values to be used for populating subsequent forms is to prompt the user to view and complete an "autofill profile" the first time a form is used. If the browser determines that no autofill profile has been created for the user, then when the user attempts to submit the completed form, profile generator function 205c extracts the name, address, and phone number entered by the user, fills out the corresponding fields in autofill profile 203 by matching field labels in form 250 with those in autofill profile 203, and prompts the user to fill in missing data items such as e-mail.

Further, Kennedy discloses at col. 8, lines 11-45, that a dialog box is presented to the user after he clicks on a "submit form" button where no autofill profile yet exists. The user is invited to use the form he or she just completed as the basis for completing an autofill profile. If the user selects "yes", an autofill profile form such as that shown in FIG. 6 is displayed to the user. Data values for the fields that were filled in by the user in FIG. 4 are extracted, matched with the fields in the autofill profile, and presented to the user as shown in FIG. 6. In other words, the profile is partially created by an automatic matching process to save the

user the inconvenience of manually entering fields that were previously filled out in FIG. 4. Thus, thus, the matching disclosed by Kennedy involves matching data values for fields that were filled in by the user with fields in the autofill profile, in order to populate those fields in the autofill profile with the values filled in by the user.

Kennedy does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, as is required by claim 3.

Thus, even when Day and Kennedy are combined, the resulting combination still fails to disclose or suggest the requirements of claim 3, of requiring monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field.

Therefore, the present invention according to claim 3, and according to claims 10-15, which depend therefrom, are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-2 and 4-9 are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy. Likewise, claims 1-2 and 4-9 are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy and further in view of Nishiyama. The combination of Day and Kennedy, or Day, Kennedy and Nishiyama do not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, as is required by claim 1

Day discloses displaying a tool in response to the highlighting of a particular field, and not displaying something according to the value entered into the highlighted field.

Kennedy discloses entering values from a form into a profile and from a profile into a form based on whether or not any values were entered into fields of the form. Kennedy does not disclose or suggest displaying anything based on a value that is entered matching a stored value.

Nishiyama discloses detecting a constituent element which represents an entry item from among received Internet documents, based on the document structure data of a document such as an HTML document containing the entry item key, comparing the entry item key of the detected entry item with the entry item key registered in a database, thereby automatically entering in the entry item the user's name, address, phone number, and the like corresponding to the entry

item key registered in the database which has been matched as a result of comparison. Thus, Nishiyama merely discloses the storage of selected data in a database. Nishiyama does not disclose or suggest disclose or suggest displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, as is required by claim 1.

Even when Day and Kennedy or Day, Kennedy, and Nishiyama are combined, the resulting combination still does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field.

Therefore, claim 1, claims 2, and 4-9, which depend from claim 1, are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy or over Day in view of Kennedy and further in view of Nishiyama.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is allowable over the references relied upon in the Office Action. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4047 (19111.0057).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: October 23, 2007

Bingham McCutchen LLP
2020 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 373-6000